<center>**REMARKS**</center>

In the official action mailed on **13 May 2009**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-3, 5-13, 15-23, and 25-32. Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-13, 15-23, and 25-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Atkinson et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0012329, hereinafter "Atkinson"), Hamilton, II et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,107,330, hereinafter "Hamilton"), and Venners (*"Design with Dynamic Extension"* JavaWorld.com January 01, 1999, hereinafter "Venners").

Applicant and Examiner had a brief discussion on 11 August, 2009. Examiner suggested that Applicant proceed with filing of the office action response, and that Applicant should be expecting contact from the Examiner to discuss the amendments before the next office action is issued.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Examiner rejected independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Atkinson, Hamilton, and Venners.

Applicant respectfully points out that the combined system of Atkinson, Hamilton, Venners fails to teach that (1) **the dynamic extension profile provides commands that allow the client to query the service provider to determine which service profiles are available on the service provider;** and (2) **the dynamic extension profile provides commands for transferring the service profile from the service provider to the client**.

Applicant respectfully points out that Venners is directed to a dynamic class loader for java programming which allows **dynamically loading types into a program**. Examiner avers that this dynamic class loader reads on the dynamic extension profile in the present invention because the dynamic class loader facilitates choosing at runtime classes and interfaces to load and use them. However, the dynamic extension profile in the present invention is distinct from the dynamic class loader in Venners because the dynamic extension profile in the present invention has the following features: (1) the dynamic extension profile

<center>12</center>

provides commands that allow the client to query the service provider to determine which service profiles are available on the service provider; and (2) the dynamic extension profile **provides commands for transferring the service profile from the service provider to the client** (see par. [0032] of the instant application).

Applicant respectfully submits that the above features of the present invention are not disclosed by Venners due to at least the following reasons. Firstly, dynamic class loader in Venners and dynamic extension profile in the present invention are directed to different applications. More specifically, dynamic class loader in Venners does not explicitly exist in a client-service provider environment; whereas the dynamic extension profile in the present invention exists in the client-service provider environment, more specifically, on the service provider. Hence, it is not obvious to apply the concept of the dynamic class loader from the Java programming application to a client-service provider application for installing service profiles. Secondly, dynamic class loader in Venners and dynamic extension profile in the present invention have different functionalities. More specifically, the dynamic class loader in Venners is used to load classes into a Java program; whereas the dynamic extension profile in the present invention facilitates the client to query the service provider to determine which service profiles are available on the service provider; and facilitates transferring the service profile from the service provider to the client.

Application additionally points out that Atkinson and Hamilton are directed to requesting and receiving a conventional service profile from a service provider to the client device, but not a dynamic extension profile. Hence, there is nothing within Atkinson, Hamilton, and Venners, either separately or in concert, which suggests that (1) **the dynamic extension profile provides commands that allow the client to query the service provider to determine which service profiles are available on the service provider**; and (2) **the dynamic extension profile provides commands for transferring the service profile from the service provider to the client**.

13

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 to clarify that in the instant application, the dynamic extension profile provides commands that allow the client to query the service provider to determine which service profiles are available on the service provider; and provides commands for transferring the service profile from the service provider to the client. These amendments find support in par. [0032] of the instant application. No new matter has been added.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-3 and 5-10, which depend upon claim 1, claims 12-13 and 15-20, which depend upon claim 11, claims 22-23 and 25-30, which depend upon claim 21, and claim 32, which depends upon claim 31, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By   /Shun Yao/
             Shun Yao
             Registration No. 59,242

Date: 13 August 2009

Shun Yao
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1667
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: shun@parklegal.com